

Claim 1 recites, "a locking mechanism for holding the rotating unit in place when the rotating unit is in the operating position" The Examiner cited column 7, lines 10-8, 29-31 [sic] and Figures 3 and 4 of Rodriguez as disclosing a "a locking mechanism for holding the rotating unit in place when the rotating unit is in the operating position." The cited passage does not show, teach, or suggest a locking mechanism.

Claims 2-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodriguez. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in combination with the additional limitations of Claims 2-12.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner stated, "Rodriguez, Jr. et al. do not teach the a color wheel (color wheel 238) to be included in the frame 204. Instead, Rodriguez, Jr. et al. teach the color wheel (color wheel 238) to be included in the projection head 206. However, Rodriguez, Jr. et al. teach the rearrangement of elements included in the projection head 206, wherein elements are moved to be included in the frame 204 for reducing the size and weight of the projection head 206 (see Col. 11, line 65 to Col. 12, line 1)." The applicant respectfully disagrees. Rodriguez expressly teaches away from the modification proposed by the Examiner, beginning on line 3 of column 12 which states, "A sequential color wheel 238, a projection lens 240, and condensing optics 246, including a condensing mirror 239, remain within the projector head 206." (Emphasis added.)

Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 14-20 depend from Claim 13 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 13, the prior art does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 13, much less the limitations of Claim 13 in combination with the additional limitations of Claims 14-20.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version With Markings To

Show Changes Made."

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-20, accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418

**Version With Markings To Show Changes Made**

**In the claims:**

Claim 15 has been amended as follows:

15. (amended) The system of Claim 13, wherein the optical unit is translated [at an angle] from the stow position to the operating position.